



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

50

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/157,697	09/21/1998	RAJEEV BYRISETTY	777.180US1	2801
45979	7590	05/18/2005	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COLE LLP/MSFT P. O. BOX 1247 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			KANG, PAUL H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	
DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/157,697

Applicant(s)

BYRISETTY ET AL.

Examiner

Paul H. Kang

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,12-21,23-25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10,12-21,23-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/22/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 10, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson et al., US Pat. No. 5,907,324, in view of Okanoue et al., US Pat. No. 6,240,089.
3. As to claims 1, 10, 20 and 25, Larson teaches a client computer and a computer readable medium comprising a processor, a computer-readable medium, and a computer program (Larson, col. 4, line 60 – col. 6, line 19) executed by the processor from the medium to query a first server (col. 9, lines 10-47), disposed to manage data of a first type, to obtain conferences maintained by the first server and a list of users maintained by the first server (col. 9, lines 10 – col. 10, line 60; list of conferences and users, as well as other conference characteristics, are obtained through the Browser 82) and to query each server on the server list to learn of at least one conference maintained by each server on the server list (col. 9, lines 58 – col. 10, line 60; the Planner and Persistent Conference Manager allow the user to link to the specific conference to obtain further details about the conference).

Art Unit: 2141

However, Larson does not explicitly teach two servers, a first type of server for maintaining a conference and a list of users and a second type of server to maintain a list of the first type of servers. In the same field of endeavor, Okanou teaches maintaining a first type of servers disposed to manage data of a first type and a second type disposed to store a list of the first type (Okanou teaches a participation group table comprising those hosts having active sessions, col. 13, line 51 – col. 14, line 33).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated multiple server conference tracking as taught by Okanou into the conferencing system of Larson for the purpose of enhancing the management and identification of conference groups.

4. Claims 2-4, 7, 15, 17, 21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-Okanou in view of Meubus et al., US Pat. No. 6,185,565.

5. As to claims 4, Larson-Okanou teach the invention substantially as claimed. However, Larson-Okanou does not explicitly teach the use of an internet locator service (ILS) type of server. In the same field of endeavor, Meubus teaches the use of an ILS server (Meubus, col. 8, line 49 – col. 9, line 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the ILS server as taught by Meubus into the system of Larson-Okanou for the purpose of enhancing system efficiency by implementing a dynamic directory structure.

Art Unit: 2141

6. As to claims 2, 3, 7, 15, 17, 21 and 27, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus teach maintaining a user list through use of conference objects having addresses and connection status (Larson, col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 67).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-Okanoue-Me in view of Lister et al., US Pat. No. 6,167,446.

8. As to claim 5, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus teach the invention substantially as claimed. However, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus does not explicitly teach the use of a NT Directory Server (NTDS). In the same field of endeavor, Lister teaches the use of an NTDS (Lister, col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 23). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the NTDS as taught by Lister into the system of Larson-Okanoue-Meubus for the purpose of implementing a widely known and used server into the network.

9. Claims 6, 8, 9, 12-14, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister in view of Kumar, US Pat. No. 6,163,531.

10. As to claim 9, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister teach the invention substantially as claimed. However, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister does not explicitly teach the use of Session Description Protocol (SDP). In the same field of endeavor, Kumar teaches the implementation of

Art Unit: 2141

SDP in a distributed conferencing system (Kumar, col. 5, line 26 – col. 6, line 67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the SDP as taught by Kumar into the conferencing system of Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister for the purpose of efficient management of conferencing properties and information.

11. Claims 6, 8, 12-14, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister-Kumar in view of DeSimone et al., US Pat. No. 6,138,144.

12. As to claim 19, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister-Kumar discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister-Kumar do not explicitly teach the use of ILS and NTDS. In the same field of endeavor, DeSimone teaches the use of ILS and NTDS (DeSimone, col. 7, line 36 – col. 8, line 60 and Lister, col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 23). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of ILS and NTDS into the conferencing system of Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister-Kumar for the purpose of implementing the system using a widely used and accepted for their reliability and stability.

13. As to claims 6, 8, 23, 24 and 28, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister-Kumar teaches security features for authenticating users (DeSimone, col. 7, line 13-49).

Art Unit: 2141

14. As to claims 12-14, 16 and 18, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister-Kumar teaches setting up a conference, determining participation of conference, querying and updating conference profiles (DeSimone, col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 21 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 6, line 57).

15. As to claim 29, Larson-Okanoue-Meubus-Lister-Kumar teach a system wherein data of the first type is dynamic and second type is static (DeSimone, col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 21 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 6, line 57).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed December 22, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue in substance that:

A) “each of the independent claims recites querying a server to obtain a list of servers. Claims 1, 20, and 25 recite ‘query to obtain the server list.’ Claim 10 recites ‘querying...the server of the second type...to learn of the server of the first type.’ Since Larson does not teach such querying, the Examiner relies on Okanoué. Okanoué, however, neither teaches nor suggests that a host agent is queried (e.g. by a mobile agent) for its table of multicast groups to obtain a list of originators.” See Applicants’ Remarks of December 22, 2004, page 9.

As to point A, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants’ contentions. Larson was relied upon for substantially all of the claimed invention with the exception of a first and second type of servers. Therefore, Larson is relied upon for the “querying” a server for session information. Okanoué, contrary to applicants’ contention, was not relied upon specifically for the

Art Unit: 2141

“querying” function. Therefore, the prior art, as applied in the Office Action, teach the invention as claimed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul H. Kang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hour flex. First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PAUL H. KANG
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER